

# PLANNING AHEAD

## Notes for the Planning and Policy Community

Volume 4, Issue 5

August 2001

---

### In This Issue

Senior Planning Vacancies .....	1
Planning "Core Curriculum" Taking Shape.....	5
Inland Waterways Users Board .....	5
Items of Note - On the Web .....	6
Upcoming Meetings .....	7
DynaMap 2000 Database Acquired .....	7
HQUSACE Hosts Tribal Issues Workshop.....	8
Corps Hosts Chesapeake Bay Watershed Workshop .....	9
Contaminated Sediment Management – An Emerging Challenge for the Corps Planning Program .	10
Sacramento District (and others) Support the 2002 Olympics .....	11
South Pacific Division's Annual Planning Conference.....	11
Credit and Reimbursement for Sponsor Performed Work .....	12
Instructions for Contributors to Planning Ahead .....	16
Subscribing to Planning Ahead.....	16
Submissions Deadline .....	16

(Ed. Note – Click on the page number in the Table of Contents to jump to the specific article. To return to the Table of Contents, click on the [book icon](#).)

### Senior Planning Vacancies

We have created this special section in *Planning Ahead* to highlight vacancy announcements for senior planning positions, especially planning chief positions. We encourage all divisions and districts to place senior planner position announcements in *Planning Ahead* to give them greater visibility. Also you can find most vacancy announcements at <http://cpol.army.mil/va/scripts/public.html>

### Institute for Water Resources

Institute for Water Resources has a second interdisciplinary, GS-15, position open, announcement number *NCR3038-01-CH*. This announcement closes on 17 August 2001, but we have requested an extension of that date. POC is Carol Koslow, HECSA CPAC, (703) 428-7327, DSN 328-7327, or you may contact Mr. Robert A. Pietrowsky, Director, Institute for Water Resources, (703) 428-8015.

GS-15 Chief of Decision Methodologies Division. Responsible for overall planning, development, organizations and execution of a study program focused on the economic, social and environmental aspects of water resources

planing. Directs the development of new and improved investment planning and economic evaluation concepts, methods, analytical procedures, and computer based decision support systems. Leads coordination with OASA (CW), HQUSACE, divisions and districts, and other Federal agencies on policies, programs and technical activities for water resources planning processes and methods, economics, environmental analysis, flood damage reduction, navigation, hydropower, recreation and water supply.

#### Headquarters - Planning and Policy

The Planning Management Branch is recruiting for two GS - 14 positions to serve as Senior Water Resources Program Planner with responsibility for the management of Civil Works planning activities on water resource studies and projects. The incumbent provides guidance to the field on a variety of matters pertaining to the conduct of reconnaissance studies, feasibility studies, PED studies, and other pre- and post-authorization planning activities. The vacancy announcement is NCR2994-01-CH. The closing date is September 6, 2001. By the way, the salary information on the announcement is incorrect. The correct salary range for a GS - 14 in the Washington area is \$74,697 - \$97,108. For more information contact Zoltan Montvai at 202-761-4477.

#### Headquarters - Operations

Professional Development Assignment Chief, Civil Emergency Management Branch: Participant will serve as the Chief, Emergency Management Branch and functions as manager and agency technical authority/advisor of all aspects of the emergency management program. The individual develops readiness standards for the Corps of Engineers and reviews USACE readiness capabilities and posture. Develop and oversees the program for preparedness and response to the full spectrum of civil disasters and national emergencies and is responsible for developing, recommending, and implementing emergency management policy and action procedures for the HQUSACE in matters dealing with civil disasters and national emergencies. Manages the program for planning the Corps of Engineers annual requirements for disaster preparedness. Develops strategic plans for the future direction of USACE emergency management program. The individual will supervise the formulation and execution of budget strategies and justification in connection with civil appropriation categories for emergency flood control and coastal activities. Manages the Corps of Engineers responsibilities and mission as dictated by Public Law 84-99 for Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies and the Stafford act (as directed by FEMA). The individual will formulate the USACE readiness training, exercise, and evaluation and corrective action program. Maintain a close liaison with FEMA, HQ Dept of the Army and other key federal agencies to ensure USACE responsiveness in time of crisis, and to assist in interagency planning and programming in emergency response, readiness, and operational matters. Will serve as technical authority within the Corps of Engineers addressing all aspects of emergency management. The assignment will be filled at the GS-15 level. Applicants at the GS-14 level with one year of specialized experience equivalent to at least the GS-14 grade level will apply for a temporary promotion, and those at the GS-15 level will apply for a detail. The assignment will be for a period not to exceed one year beginning on or about 22 October 2001, and ending on or about 1 November 2002. Additional information or clarification may be obtained by contacting Liz Miller at (202) 761-4605

#### Alaska District

Economics Section, Team Leader Vacancy: The Corps of Engineers, Alaska District, is looking for a top quality Regional Economist to serve as the Chief of the Economics Section of the Civil Works Branch. Position will be filled as a GS-13 Regional Economist. Permanent Change of Station (moving) costs are authorized.

Alaska District, Civil Works Branch, studies complex civil works projects such as commercial boat harbors, deep draft navigation, storm damage reduction, and bank stabilization. The future workload in the Alaska District looks strong and is growing. Be looking for the job announcement on the internet or for more information, please contact Carl Borash, acting CW Branch Chief at (907) 753-2609.

#### Honolulu District

Honolulu Engineer District has one vacancy, GS-xxx-12, Interdisciplinary for a Project Manager in the Civil Works area. The District's workload is small but rewarding, servicing small communities- we have projects in Hawaii, Guam, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa. Individual responsible for managing plan formulation, scheduling, budgeting, customer interface, report preparation, upward reporting, heading up PDT, assuring contract awards, managing during construction. Office is at Fort Shafter, an Army installation in Honolulu vicinity - parking no problem. Great island atmosphere and friendly people. COLA 25% tax-free of Uncle Sam, but State taxable. No locality pay which adds to base pay. Relocation payable, if selected. Mainly navigation and shore protection, but some flood control and ecosystem work. Studies and construction - workload in range of \$10 M to \$15 M per year in CW. Currently 11 PM positions handling CW and SFO type work in the Branch.

#### San Francisco District

The San Francisco District (SPN) currently is recruiting for a GS-13 Regional Water Resources Plan Formulation Specialist and a GS 13 Regional Fishery biologist. The area covered by the District is roughly a 40,000 sq. mi. of California and southern Oregon, including the San Francisco Bay area. The San Francisco District is a medium-sized organization with a consistently growing GI program (currently about \$11 million). Management and leadership in the District's area is especially interesting and challenging as many of the sophisticated local sponsors are well funded and politically savvy. Information on the District can be found in the SPN internet site at <http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/>.

Duty location is a 333 Market Street in downtown San Francisco, California (co-located with the South Pacific Division headquarters office), and is easily accessible from public transportation. The San Francisco Bay, and numerous excellent restaurants and shops are located within easy walking distance. The area offers a wide variety of cultural, recreational, and educational opportunities. The climate in the bay area is very moderate with wet winters and dry summers. Additional information on the San Francisco area can be found at <http://www.sfvisitor.org/>.

Because of the higher cost of living, especially housing, the position salary, which ranges from \$67,000 to \$87,000 per annum, includes a 15.01% locality payment. The housing costs, which typically range from \$240,000 to \$450,000, decline as the commuting distance increases; however, there is excellent public transportation including the light rail (BART), city and commuter buses, high-speed ferries, and van and car pools.

Inquires in regards to these positions are actively encouraged. Please feel free to contact Mr. Tom Kendall Planning Branch at telephone 415-977-8532.

A selection list will be requested from the Western Civilian Personnel Operations Center (CPOC) soon. Unlike other CPOC's, the West Region CPOC does not advertise positions. To be considered for this position, you must have a one to two-page resume and supplemental data sheet RESUMIX application submitted with the West Region CPOC. Information on preparing these documents may be found on the World Wide Web

@ <http://www.cpoc.army.mil> . Resumes and supplemental data sheets may be e-mailed to [resumix@cpocwcp.army.mil](mailto:resumix@cpocwcp.army.mil) or mailed to Department of the Army, West Regional Civilian Personnel Operations Center, Building 61801, PO Box 12926, Fort Huachuca, AZ 85670-2926.

## Sacramento District

Sacramento District is recruiting to fill an Interdisciplinary GS-14 Chief, Water Resources Branch (basically a Plan Formulation Branch). The position is responsible for a 48-person Branch, conducting plan formulation and related planning studies over all or portions of 8 western states, including central California. Sacramento District has one of the Corps' largest Planning programs. Check out the Districts' web site. To apply, create a resume and supplemental data sheet on RESUMIX at the Western Region CPOC, <http://www.cpoc.army.mil> no later than 31 Aug. For additional information, contact Ken Hitch at 916-557-6699 or [khitch@spk.usace.army.mil](mailto:khitch@spk.usace.army.mil)

## Wilmington District

Economist, GS-0110-13. Serves as a Technical Economic Specialist responsible for the initiation, formulation, planning, execution, and control of economic, social and financial activities for proposed and authorized Civil Works projects for flood control, navigation, beach erosion, hurricane protection, environmental restoration, recreation, water supply and others. Acts as the District's liaison with South Atlantic Division HQ, HQUSACE, and ASA (CW) on the preparation, review, interpretation, dissemination, and implementation of all economic related guidance. Serves on a District Technical Review Team conducting independent reviews of all Planning reports and is responsible for adherence to current regulations on economic, social and financial matters in accordance with Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water Resources Studies. Responsible for the proper acquisition of large amounts of data used in the economic analysis of water resources projects. Acts as the District's liaison with non-federal sponsors in the development and review of financial capability analyses, as required by Corps policy, for Civil Works projects. Acts as an economic advisor to the District Engineer, Chief, Planning and Environmental Branch, Chief, Planning Services Section, other District managers. Is responsible for the accuracy of economic analyses for actions approved by the District Engineer, such as water reallocation contracts less than 100 af and has oversight responsibility on all work conducted by all economists in the District. Serves as a mentor to new and inexperienced staff. Serves as final advisor on economic related matters for the Wilmington District, is responsible for the professionalism, thoroughness, and significance of the conclusions and the quality of the reports, whose conclusions and presentation must meet the stringent requirements for congressional authorization in periodic Water Resource Development legislation. Plans, directs, coordinates, and reviews economic base studies, socio-economic studies, and other special economic studies of existing and proposed civil and military works project conducted by all District economists. Initiates, directs, plans, and executes research plans and studies pertaining to the overall problem of analyzing the complexities of economic and social impact analyses related to projects and activities conducted by the Wilmington District. Responsible for social impact assessment including consideration of individual, community, area, national and aggregate effects. Critically analyzes economic studies developed by federal and/or state and local agencies and/or private contractors relative to proposed water resources and military projects. Performs as an adviser in coordinating with the Planning Services Section Chief in the assignment of work to economists and determining work schedules and priorities.

## Portland District


Position (282-DEU-01) is established to serve three major functions: 1) to serve as the expert in economic risk and life-cycle cost analysis of hydropower major rehabilitation projects for the district, and when requested for NWD, HAC, HDC, and other districts; 2) to serve as Portland District's senior specialist and leader of Economic studies; and (3) serves as the District's expert on the economic aspects of regional navigation projects. For more information contact Martin Hudson, Chief of Planning.



## Planning "Core Curriculum" Taking Shape

*Mark Dunning, IWR*

As part of Planning's "Hire-Train-Retain" initiative, the Chief of Engineers has approved the development of the planning core curriculum recommended by the Planning Capability Task Force. The primary objective of the core curriculum is to provide basic training needed for entry level planners to move to the journey level stage of development. The eight workshops and courses forming the core curriculum provide exposure to all the critical planning function Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSA), and broadly relate to the four competencies of the fully functional planner: formulation, economic evaluation, environmental evaluation, and consensus building. All planners will be encouraged to complete the core curriculum.

A kick-off meeting of course developers was held in July to lay out schedules and basic design parameters for each of the core curriculum courses. Development of all courses is scheduled to be completed in the Spring of 2002. Courses will then be brought to sites within each MSC on a periodic basis to make it easy for planning staff to attend. The intent is for planners to be able to complete the entire core curriculum within a three-year period. More detail on the core curriculum and each of the eight courses under development can be found at the Planning Capabilities web-site: [www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/PlanningCapabilities](http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/iwr/PlanningCapabilities). The web-site also provides information on other on-going and contemplated Hire-Train-Retain initiatives. For additional information, contact Russ Rangos, CECW-PG or Mark Dunning, IWR. 

## Inland Waterways Users Board

*Norm Edwards, CECW-PD*

The 39<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Board was held July 18, 2001, in Davenport, Iowa, at the River Center. In conjunction with this Board meeting, a tour of the Mississippi River Locks and Dams Nos. 11, 12 and 14 was conducted on July 17, 2001. Board meetings are open to the public and a notice of the meeting was published in the Federal Register during the month of June.

During the meeting, the Board determined that it would next meet in Florida during early November. The Board also heard presentations on projects underway in MVD, the host Division for this meeting. The meeting agenda additionally included presentations on the status of the Upper Mississippi River Navigation Study, the Inner Harbor Navigation Canal (IHNC) Lock Project, FY 2002 funding, and the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. Also included were four presentations on: 1) the Impacts of Construction Delays; 2) Scheduling, Permits and Tolls; 3) Congestion Impacts and Lock Capacity Constraints; and 4) the Major Rehabilitation Program. The

central business of the meeting was achieving consensus on Investment Priorities and the Annual Report. For more information, contact Norm Edwards, CECW-PD, at (202) 761-4559.

## Items of Note - On the Web

*Ellen Cummings – CECW-PD*

You can click on <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/usace-docs/> to get to the main publication page and then the “What’s New” link to keep track of the new publications.

Other websites of interest:

IWR has posted the Water Challenges brochure, national summary report, and regional reports, which resulted from the sixteen nationwide Listening Sessions are available at: <http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges>. The ten major challenge areas identified by the attendees are: Marine Transportation System, Restoring and Protecting the Environment, Managing Watersheds Holistically, Floodplain and Coastal Zone Management, Responding to Natural Disasters, Community Water Infrastructure, Regulating Dredge and Fill Activities, Recreation, Project Processes, and Institutional Changes.

WRDA on the web. Robert Wolfe, SPD compiled a PDF file that contains every WRDA from 1976 through 2000. CECW-B has placed it on the web at [http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwb/wrda76-00plus\\_rsw.pdf](http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwb/wrda76-00plus_rsw.pdf). This is a very large file at just over 8-MB.

Information on the water quality of over 50 river basins and aquifers obtained as a result of USGS’ National Water Quality Assessment Program is available at <http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa>.

For additional information about water quality try <http://www.epa.gov/waters>. This site integrates information from state and EPA sites with the USGS National Hydrographic Dataset. Currently available is information on the designated use for waterbodies, the list of impaired waterbodies under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and the status of control actions known as TMDLs.

The Stream Corridor Restoration Handbook (NEH Part 653) has been updated on the web site at [http://www.usda.gov/stream\\_restoration](http://www.usda.gov/stream_restoration). The addenda are clearly identified for downloading and inserting into the hardcopies. There are no plans to reprint the handbook at this time. It is possible to download the entire document as one file (~33Mbytes) if you wish.

A Stream Corridor Training module has been developed based on the Handbook. The content of the training modules (2 CD’s) can be downloaded from the following anonymous FTP site: <ftp://ftp.nhq.nrcs.usda.gov>. Go to the folder *pub/outgoing/jbernard/Stream-Restoration-Training-CDs*. Once there, you will see subdirectories for the two training CDs, plus another directory that contains additional training information. Some files are large and require substantial download times. This information can be accessed using Netscape 4.73 and above but could not be accessed with MS Internet Explorer 5.50.

Need to obtain some information for a particular state? This web site, [http://www.dfg.ca.gov/html/links\\_st.html](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/html/links_st.html), posted by the California Department of Fish and Game will let you access each state agency that has a web page.

Using the wetlands interactive mapper tool that U.S.F&WS has loaded at [http://wetlands.fws.gov/mapper\\_tool.htm](http://wetlands.fws.gov/mapper_tool.htm) you can view wetlands in relation to streets and streams, print maps, obtain wetland classification information and wetland acreage. Query by county, city, zip code, or Lat/Long. USGS topographic maps of the area may also be viewed. Additionally information on the National Wetlands Inventory is accessible.


If you are aware of a site that may be of interest to others, please send a note with the address and brief description to Ellen Cummings or Harry Kitch.

## Upcoming Meetings

*Compiled by Ellen Cummings*

WATERSHED 2002. Sponsored by the Water Environment Federation and the Florida Water Environment Association, this conference will be held 23-27 February at the Wyndham Resort and Spa in Fort Lauderdale, FL. The conference will highlight Everglades restoration activities of the past, present, and future and provide a forum to discuss the recovery and long-term preservation of this International Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage Site. However, among the topics for which abstracts were requested are watershed approaches to drought management; habitat restoration and improvement options and effectiveness; habitat monitoring and assessment; and watershed protection and sustainable development. To receive a conference brochure (available in September) send your mailing address to [confinfo@wef.org](mailto:confinfo@wef.org). Specify this conference in your request because it appears that the same email address is being used for several conferences.

NATIONAL BROWNFIELDS 2001 CONFERENCE. This 2.5-day conference is being held at the McCormick Place Convention Center in Chicago, 24-26 September 2001. Attendees may learn about the “nuts and bolts” of brownfields redevelopment, leveraging resources through partnerships, making it happen with practical approaches and optimizing the value of redevelopment. Registration is free but there is a nominal charge for two box lunches. Although it states on the website that registration closes 24 August, the organizers have informed us that late registrations will be accepted. For more information check out <http://www.brownfields2001.org>.

If you are aware of an upcoming meeting that may be of interest to others, please send a note with the address and brief description to Ellen Cummings or Harry Kitch. 

## DynaMap 2000 Database Acquired

*Andrew J. Bruzewicz – ERDC-CRRL*

The US Army Corps of Engineers has acquired and distributed Geographic Data Technology's (GDTs) DynaMap 2000 database to all Corps districts, divisions, laboratories, the Institute for Water Resources, and headquarters. Initiated by a request from Steve Cobb and others in the Mississippi Valley Division, and a desire to see a common set of base data available to all Corps entities, data were purchased from GDT, duplicated at the Corps' Remote Sensing/GIS Center, and provided to the Geospatial Data and Systems (G D & S) coordinators at each activity. (A list of the coordinators can be found at <http://corpsgeo1.usace.army.mil> Choosing the Point of Contact option enables a search by name, organization, or the complete list.) These data can be copied and



distributed within any Corps activity for use on as many machines and at as many sites as desired, but cannot be provided to anyone outside the Corps. (A copy of the licensing agreement noting all restrictions and requirements is online at [http://gis.usace.army.mil/gdt\\_license.pdf](http://gis.usace.army.mil/gdt_license.pdf).)

Data have been provided in ArcView's shape file format and include: streets, railroads, hydrography, census tracts and block groups, airports, schools, public buildings, hospitals, parks, recreation areas, golf courses, universities, institutions, major retail centers, transportation terminals, county boundaries, place names, Primary Metropolitan Statistical Areas (PMSAs), Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), Minor Civil Divisions (MCDs), Designated Market Areas (DMAs), zip codes, and landmarks from the US Department of Interior's Geographic Names Information System (GNIS) with features such as monuments, military installations, prisons, government centers, and post offices. Additional information about the DynaMap 2000 data can be found at <http://www.geographic.com/support/supdownload.cfm> or by contacting Andy Bruzewicz.

These data are provided as a 'jump start' to all activities to serve as a framework, or base data set. Particularly for those groups just beginning to use GIS, these data can be used as is to develop maps using most standard GIS software packages and also can be combined with environmental, geological, elevation and other more detailed site specific data as required for analysis and project purposes. Across the Corps, as well as within districts and divisions, these data provide our organization the opportunity to use a single, common base data set that is regularly updated by the vendor. Presently, these data are being considered as base data for use in Corps-wide GIS applications including GIS-v, a corporate viewer for the display of critical features important to Corps operations such as locks and dams, stream gages, and Corps projects, and for ENGLink Geospatial, an online GIS capability for emergency management that is a component of the Corps' emergency management command and control Intranet software. A survey to determine uses being made of the data, preferred format(s), and additional data needs is to be completed by each G D & S coordinator no later than 30 November 2001 and returned to Nancy Blyler, the Geospatial Data Coordinator at Headquarters, US Army Corps of Engineers. The survey can be seen at: [http://gis.usace.army.mil/gdt\\_data\\_survey.doc](http://gis.usace.army.mil/gdt_data_survey.doc). Contact [Andrew.J.Bruzewicz@erdc.usace.army.mil](mailto:Andrew.J.Bruzewicz@erdc.usace.army.mil) for additional information.

## HQUSACE Hosts Tribal Issues Workshop

*Paul D. Rubenstein – CECW-PG*

A two-day Tribal Issues Workshop was held on 24 - 25 July 2001 between members of the HQUSACE Tribal Issues Group (TIG) and the Alaska Native Liaison and Native American Coordinators from USACE Commands. Rich Taylor and Ted Kanamine designed the Workshop, both in the Directorate of Military Programs, and Paul Rubenstein, Planning and Policy Division. The purpose of the two-day session was to chart a path for building effective relationships with tribal partners during the near term (FY 01/02). Workshop objectives included: informing and communicating on common tribal issues/initiatives; trading information between Corps Commands and Headquarters; building a "total tribal team;" and, reviewing a draft document entitled "The USACE Tribal Nations Strategy" for use as a baseline tool for improvement.

The workshop began with overview presentations by guests from the upper echelons of the Department of Defense and Army. Mr. James Van Ness and Mr. Len Richeson, representing the DOD Office of General Counsel and Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environment and Installations), respectively, presented views on Indian law and tribal trust requirements. Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Policy and Legislation), Chip Smith, spoke on the Army Civil Works picture of tribal issues. Workshop participants then began their participation with brief presentations and participation in exercises structured to examine a number of critical issues through identification, evaluation and problem solving.



By the completion of the workshop, Corps specialists had evaluated key initiatives, operational environments, impacts and limitations on USACE-tribal relationships. In addition, they reviewed and recommended updates for, and improvements to, the draft Tribal Nations Strategy. That document is currently under revision and will soon be provided to Corps senior leaders to endorse as a contributor to our strategic vision Paul Rubenstein, CECW-PG [📖](#)

## Corps Hosts Chesapeake Bay Watershed Workshop

*Larry Eastman - CENAB*

On June 4 and 5, 2001, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, Planning Division, sponsored a workshop entitled “Chesapeake Bay 2001- Integrating Environmental and Facility Management to Create Sustainable Facilities”. The workshop, held at the National Wildlife Visitor Center at the Patuxent Research Refuge in Laurel, Maryland, provided Federal facility managers and others whose actions impact the watershed of the bay with an overview of sustainability concepts, low impact development approaches and practical environmental management tools. The workshop was the second in a series of Chesapeake Bay workshops sponsored by the Baltimore District to reach out to Federal, state and local members of the Bay watershed community interested in improving the environmental performance of their operations. The workshop is part of the Corps’ continuing effort to provide leadership in environmental stewardship, habitat protection and ecosystem restoration.

In his opening remarks, moderator Robert Pace, a senior technical advisor from Planning Division, cited the definition of “sustainability” as “development which meets the needs of the present without comprising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”

The workshop was designed to help Federal land and facility managers better integrate environmental considerations into project design, construction, site operations and facility management activities. Workshop topics included an overview of ongoing efforts and tools to improve watershed management, achievement of sustainable facilities including “greening the government” initiatives, Executive Order requirements, Chesapeake Bay Program requirements and improved stormwater management techniques through low-impact development. Numerous case studies were presented during the two-day workshop.

Approximately 75 people, representing the Army, Navy, Department of Defense, NASA, EPA, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and many other Federal, state and private organizations were in attendance.

For more information on the conference or Corps programs on the Chesapeake Bay, contact either Robert Pace or Larry Eastman of the Baltimore District at (410) 962-4905. [📖](#)

## Contaminated Sediment Management – An Emerging Challenge for the Corps Planning Program

*Richard Worthington – CECW-P*

In a 1997 report, the Environmental Protection Agency estimated that 96 watersheds nationwide contain areas of probable concern with regard to contaminated sediments and that more than 1.2 billion cubic yards of contaminated sediment exist nationwide. This problem is particularly severe in many urban watersheds where contaminated sediments degrade aquatic habitat and limit economic and recreational uses of waterfront areas.

The Corps, in coordination with EPA, has a long history of identifying, assessing, and managing contaminated sediments in conjunction with constructing and maintaining Federal navigation channels. We have also developed a strong technical expertise in restoring contaminated sites through our work for EPA in the Superfund Program and Base Realignment and Closure, Formerly Used Defense Sites, and Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program cleanups. The application of this expertise to the Civil Works Program in helping communities restore their watersheds is beginning to emerge. A modest program of technical, planning, and engineering assistance in the Great Lakes Region has been ongoing for over a decade in the Remedial Action Plan Program but has not resulted in any Corps participation in implementing contaminated sediment removal and remediation. The initial authority for Corps participation in environmental dredging projects for removal and remediation of contaminated sediments is contained in Section 312 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1990. As initially drafted Section 312 had daunting non-Federal sponsor requirements which effectively precluded the use of the authority. However, amendments in WRDA 96 and particularly WRDA 99 liberalized the cost sharing requirements. Also, in response to strong Congressional interest and direction, the latest guidance on implementing Section 312 lifted the prohibition on use of Civil Works funds for removal and remediation of contaminated sediments complying with the definition of hazardous substances in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) if the Corps can obtain reasonable protection from liabilities arising as a result of the removal and remediation.

Part of the Congressional, state and local government, and private interest motivation for Corps involvement in sediment contaminated sediment removal and/or remediation is based on a view that CERCLA process has difficulty in dealing with contamination in aquatic sites where pollutants may have multiple sources and be dispersed over wide areas in varying concentrations. These interests believe that the collaborative Civil Works project development process is the best model for addressing these aquatic habitat degradation problems. The Corps position, as reflected in the latest guidance, is that the Corps does have the expertise to undertake contaminated sediment management and that restoration of the Nation's waters is a priority mission but that contaminated sediment removal and remediation must be accomplished in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, non-Federal interests and identified responsible parties to assure that the "polluter pays" principles of CERCLA are achieved. In other words planning for contaminated sediments removal and remediation should seek a synergy between the CERCLA and Civil Works project development processes.

Nationally there are eleven ongoing feasibility studies with contaminated sediments as a major focus. Two of these efforts, the Ashtabula River Environmental Dredging Project, Ohio, and the Elizabeth River Basin Environmental Restoration Project, Virginia, have completed or nearly completed feasibility reports. The experience being gained from these studies will be very valuable in shaping future policy. The other study efforts are in the early stages.


Part of the expectation for these contaminated sediment studies is that they will be the catalyst for broader watershed based assessments that examine the full range of water quality and degraded aquatic habitat conditions which limit the recreation and other economic uses of urban watersheds. The goal is to develop comprehensive plans for the economic and environmental revitalization of these areas. [!\[\]\(de95854c7ee024cfadc48187bbb781b2\_img.jpg\)](#)

## Sacramento District (and others) Support the 2002 Olympics

*Scott Stoddard - CESPK*

For over three years now Sacramento District and others in the Corps have been assisting in preparations for the 2002 Winter Olympic Games to be held in Salt Lake City, Utah. The games will begin this coming February 8<sup>th</sup> with the opening ceremonies and conclude at the end of the month. Preparations include two aquatic ecosystem restoration projects requested by the Olympic Committee as part of their environmental legacy. Other efforts include coordinating the preparedness aspects for the games – The Corps has actively participated in the Infrastructure Protection Subcommittee as well as the Regional Interagency Steering Committee. For these entities, the Corps has provided flood assessments and other threat information at the various venue sites.

Jim Eaton and Jim Wilcox, Corps security experts (Omaha & Huntsville) have been busy for some time, designing the needed security measures at the Olympic Village. Our Utah Resident Construction Office is preparing to construct these facilities this winter. Carlton Daniel of the Corps Topographic Engineering Center has also been busy preparing digital terrain models and other data for the entities responsible for making sure the games are safe from terrorism and other threats.

(FYI - The Intermountain Planning and Regulatory field offices recently collocated just north of downtown Salt Lake City. This will allow us to utilize resources more efficiently. The Intermountain Planning Office is involved in a number of Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration, Watershed, Flood Damage Reduction, Brownfields, and Environmental Infrastructure projects throughout western Colorado, southeast Idaho, eastern Nevada, Utah, and southwest Wyoming as well as much of the Navajo Reservation in northeast Arizona.) Scott Stoddard, (801) 294-7033 [sstoddard@usace.army.mil](mailto:ssoddard@usace.army.mil) 

## South Pacific Division's Annual Planning Conference

*Ken Orth - CESPD*

The South Pacific Division (SPD) held its Annual Planning Conference in Palm Springs, California on 4-7 June 2001. Our meeting was attended by over seventy planners, economists, environmental scientists, engineers, project managers and others from throughout the Division, as well as representatives from Galveston District, Rock Island District, Pacific Ocean Division and Lakes and Rivers Division. Several local sponsor representatives also attended. The Los Angeles District did an outstanding job of hosting the Conference.

Topics presented and discussed during the Conference included: Integrated Reports, Planners "e-Notebook", Congressional Outreach, the SPD Planning Website, and Ethics. Special guest speakers were LTC Landry, Deputy Commander of the Los Angeles District; Mr. Steve Stockton, Director of Civil Works and Management in the South Pacific Division, and Dr. Jim Johnson, Chief of Planning and Policy in the Headquarters' Civil Works Directorate. Mr. Bob Joe, the Executive Legislative Manager of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and formerly the Los Angeles District Chief of Planning was our Planner Emeritus speaker. Mr. John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator for Public Works in Pima County, Arizona, spoke at our awards dinner. This year's award winners were the Seven WRDA 2000 Study Teams (72 total team members) for SPD Planning Team of the year; Mr. Jim Hutchison for SPD Planner of the Year; and the Phoenix Office for SPD Planning Website of the Year. Mr. John Lucyshyn, our Headquarters Planning and Policy team member, received a Commander's Award from BG Peter Madsen for his long and trusted support to SPD.

During the Conference each of the SPD Districts had the opportunity to take advantage of the collected team experience and knowledge of the all the attendees. One-hour problem-solving sessions were facilitated by the Sacramento District (Four current problems facing the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers Comprehensive Study), by the Albuquerque District (Questions about forming a Planning office), and by the San Francisco District (Four questions about adaptive management for the Bolinas Lagoon ecosystem restoration study). The Los Angeles District undertook a more extensive problem in preparing and getting to approval on the Westminster, California 905(b) Analysis.

Prior to the conference the Westminster study team visited the study area and prepared background material for presentation to the Conference participants. On the first full day of the Conference all of the participants brainstormed lists of planning objectives, constraints, and assumptions that should guide the Westminster study, as well as lists of nonstructural and structural management measures that would address the identified objectives. The study team used those inputs and their background investigation to establish the Federal interest in proceeding into the feasibility phase. On the next day of the Conference, the study team discussed the roles of different technical disciplines in conducting feasibility phase studies, and prepared the estimates of cost and schedule for the feasibility phase work effort. An interdisciplinary team of senior planners from the four SPD districts conducted an independent technical review of the Team's documentation. On the final day of the Conference, the study team presented their result; the review team discussed their comments and their review process; and the Westminster 905(b) Analysis was technically certified by Ms. Ruth Villalobos, Los Angeles District Planning Chief. Mr. Larry Paul provided a letter of intent for Orange County (California) as a non-Federal sponsor; COL John Carroll signed the Analysis (via fax), and Mr. John Lucyshyn discussed how Headquarters processes these analyses and recommended approval. Our conference concluded with a final approval included in the presentation delivered by Dr. Jim Johnson.

The completion and approval of the Westminster 905(b) Analysis was a unique accomplishment for our Planning Conference. It was possible in large measure because the full study team, including the non-Federal partners, believed that they could do it - that they could complete the analysis and get to approval in three days during the Conference. It was also important that the non-Federal partners were very supportive and very well informed about working with the Corps. The final Analysis drew from the diverse backgrounds of over seventy participating professionals, and was a better product for their involvement. We are preparing a lessons learned report to capture the team's process and what they learned through this approach.

Please visit our website <http://www.spd.usace.army.mil/cwpm/public/plan/index.htm> for additional information on our 2001 South Pacific Division Planning Conference. (Ken Orth, CESPD-CM-P, 24 June 2001)



## Credit and Reimbursement for Sponsor Performed Work

*Alan Lauwaert, CECW-PG and Timothy D Young, CEPD-CW-PP*

1. The purpose of this article is to provide information that will help in the process to determine creditable work performed by the sponsor under the Corps Continuing Authorities Program (CAP). There are many recent provisions in WRDA 1999 and WRDA 2000 for non-Federal sponsors to receive credit for work they perform if the ASA (CW) determines that the work is integral to the project. In order to discuss credit/reimbursement, it is necessary to use and understand the following terminology:

a. Integral to the study/project - Work the Corps would accomplish either in-house or through contract if the non-Federal sponsor does not perform the work.

b. Allowable credit - The lesser of the actual audited costs expended by the non-Federal sponsor or the estimated costs incurred by the Government assuming the work is performed at the same time as the sponsor.

c. Approved credit - The features and/or amount approved for credit by the ASA (CW). Written documentation of the creditable features and amount must be transmitted to HQUSACE for forwarding to the ASA (CW) for approval.

d. Afforded credit - The approved credit amount that is accepted in lieu of sponsor contribution, which is generally in the form of a cash payment.

## 2. Work-in-Kind (General).

a. Eligible Work-in-kind. Work-in-kind does not include activities the sponsor must perform as required in agreements. Work-in-kind credits integral to the study may be in the form of in-kind services, materials or supplies performed or provided by the non-Federal sponsor during the feasibility phase, plans and specifications phase, planning and design analysis phase or construction phase.

b. Eligible Parties. Work-in-kind may only be provided by the non-Federal project sponsor and can be accomplished by the staff of the non-Federal sponsor or by contract administered by the non-Federal sponsor.

c. General Requirements. The estimated cost of the work-in-kind effort will be established prior to the initiation of the work-in-kind effort. The cost will be negotiated, based on a detailed government estimate and sponsor proposal, between the Federal Government and the non-Federal sponsor, applying applicable Federal regulations, including OMB Circular A-87. The non-Federal sponsor will comply with applicable Federal and state laws and regulations, including the requirement to secure competitive bids for all work to be performed by contract. Credit for work-in-kind will be subject to audit and if the actual costs are less than the Government estimate, the value of the credit will be reduced accordingly.

3. Work-in-kind (Section 107, 205, 103, 111). Work-in-kind shall not be performed during the Feasibility Phase until after the execution of the Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement. Section 225 of the WRDA 2000 amended Section 105(a)(1)(E) of WRDA 1986 and now allows the non-Federal sponsor to provide their entire share of feasibility study costs through the provision of in-kind services. There will be no work-in-kind credit for post feasibility phase activities.

4. Work-in-Kind (Section 1135, 206, 204). Work-in-kind accomplished after the execution of a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) for Section 1135 or Section 206 projects will be creditable if specified in the PCA. No work-in-kind credit will be allowed for Section 204 projects.

a. Eligible Work-in-Kind Credits. In accordance with ER 1105-2-100, project and decision document approval for Section 1135 and Section 206 projects will occur concurrently. Since PCA execution cannot occur until these actions and a commitment of funds have been completed, work-in-kind during the Feasibility Phase or early stages of the Planning and Design Analysis (PDA) Phase will not be creditable. Work-in-kind accomplished after PCA execution during the plans and specifications and construction phase will be creditable if specified in the PCA.

(1) Section 1135 Limits. If the value of required LERRD provided by the non-Federal sponsor is less than 25 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor shall provide, during the period of implementation, a cash contribution and/or work-in-kind to make its total contribution equal to 25 percent. If the value of required

LERRD, provided by the non-Federal sponsor, exceeds its share of total project costs, the Government may reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for the excess amount, subject to availability of funds. Credit for work-in-kind may not result in any reimbursement to the non-Federal sponsor. The combination of work-in-kind with the non-Federal provision of LERRD should not exceed the non-Federal share of 25 percent. For all section 1135 projects approved after 12 October 1996, not more than 80 percent of the non-Federal share of total project costs less LERRD will be allowed as credit for work-in-kind.

(2) Section 206 Limits. If the value of required LERRD provided by the non-Federal sponsor is less than 35 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor shall provide, during the period of implementation, a cash contribution and/or work-in-kind to make its total contribution equal to 35 percent. If the value of required LERRD, provided by the non-Federal sponsor, exceeds its share of total project costs, the Government may reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for the excess amount, subject to availability of funds. Credit for work-in-kind may not result in any reimbursement to the non-Federal sponsor. The combination of work-in-kind with the non-Federal provision of LERRD will not exceed the non-Federal share of 35 percent. The entire non-Federal share of total project costs may be credited work-in-kind.

Under Section 210 of WRDA 1999, a non-Federal sponsor may implement a section 206 aquatic ecosystem restoration project and be reimbursed for the Federal share of project construction costs if it is completed prior to 1 October 2003.

(3) Section 204 Limits. If the value of required LERRD provided by the non-Federal sponsor is less than 25 percent of total project costs, the non-Federal sponsor shall provide, during the period of implementation, a cash contribution to make its total contribution equal to 25 percent. If the value of required LERRD, provided by the non-Federal sponsor, exceeds its share of total project costs, the Government may reimburse the non-Federal sponsor for the excess amount, subject to availability of funds. Credit will not be allowed for work-in-kind.

5. Work-in-Kind (Other Contributions). Contributions of cash, funds, materials and services from other than the non-Federal sponsor may be accepted for ecosystem restoration projects (Section 1135, 206 & 204) under the provisions of Section 203 of the WRDA of 1992. However, such contributions, including work by volunteers, will not be included in the costs to be shared but instead applied to the total project costs. Therefore, these contributions will reduce both Federal and non-Federal shares of the project costs.

6. Point of Contacts for this information are:

- a. Alan J Lauwaert, Policy Advisor, CECW-PG, (202) 761-4232  
[Alan.J.Lauwaert@usace.army.mil](mailto:Alan.J.Lauwaert@usace.army.mil)
- b. Timothy Young, Civil Engineer, CEPOD-CW-PP, (808) 438-6950  
[Timothy.D.Young@pod01.usace.army.mil](mailto:Timothy.D.Young@pod01.usace.army.mil)
- c. Russ Rangos, Policy Advisor, CECW-PG, (202) 761-4241  
[Russ.Rangos@HQ02.usace.army.mil](mailto:Russ.Rangos@HQ02.usace.army.mil)



**Sponsor Cost Sharing and Work-In-Kind Credit under the Continuing Authorities Program**

<u>Program Authority</u>	<u>Non-Federal Cost Share</u>				<u>Work-in-Kind 1/ (Allowable Credit Limit Applied to Non-Fed Share)</u>
	<u>Feasibility</u>	<u>Plans &amp; Specs</u>	<u>Planning &amp; Design Analysis</u>	<u>Construction</u>	
Section 206, WRDA 96, (PL 104-303) <u>2/</u>	35%	35%	NA	35%	100% of the non-Fed share of the total project costs less LERRD may be credit for work-in-kind.
Section 206, WRDA 96, (PL 104-303) <u>3/</u>	NA	NA	35%	35%	100% of the non-Fed share of the total project costs less LERRD may be credit for work-in-kind.
Section 1135, WRDA 86, (PL 99-662) <u>2/</u>	25%	25%	NA	25%	Not more than 80% of the non-Fed share of the total project costs less LERRD may be credit for work-in-kind. <u>4/</u>
Section 1135, WRDA 86, (PL 99-662) <u>3/</u>	NA	NA	25%	25%	Not more than 80% of the non-Fed share of the total project costs less LERRD may be credit for work-in-kind. <u>4/</u>
Section 204, WRDA 92, (PL 102-580) <u>2/</u>	25%	25%	NA	25%	None Allowed
Section 204, WRDA 92, (PL 102-580) <u>3/</u>	NA	NA	25%	25%	None Allowed
Section 208 (PL- 83-780)	NA	NA	35-50%	35-50%	None Allowed
Section 14 (PL 79-526)	NA	NA	35-50%	35-50%	None Allowed
Section 107 (PL 86-645)	50% <u>5/</u>	10-50%	NA	10-50%	100% of the non-Fed share for the feasibility phase costs only may be credit for work-in-kind. <u>6/</u> .
Section 205 (PL 80-858)	50% <u>5/</u>	35-50%	NA	35-50%	100% of the non-Fed share for the feasibility phase costs only may be credit for work-in-kind. <u>6/</u> .
Section 103 (PL 87-874)	50% <u>5/</u>	35%	NA	35%	100% of the non-Fed share for the feasibility phase costs only may be credit for work-in-kind. <u>6/</u> .
Section 111 (PL 90-483)	50% <u>5/</u>	<u>7/</u>	NA	<u>7/</u>	100% of the non-Fed share for the feasibility phase costs only may be credit for work-in-kind. <u>6/</u> .

1/ Credit for work-in-kind may not result in any reimbursement to the non-Federal sponsor. The combination of work-in-kind with the non-Federal provision of LERRD cannot exceed the value of the non-Federal share. However, under Section 210 of WRDA 1999, a non-Federal sponsor may implement a Section 206 aquatic ecosystem restoration project and be reimbursed for the Federal share of the project construction costs if completed prior to 1 October 2003.

2/ Federal share of total project costs > \$1.0M (Reference ER 1105-2-100 dated 22 Apr 2000, Appendix F, Section III).

3/ Federal share of total project costs ≤ \$1.0M (Reference ER 1105-2-100 dated 22 Apr 2000, Appendix F, Section III).

4/ Projects approved after 12 October 1996 (Reference Section 210 of WRDA 96).

5/ Costs in excess of \$100,000 is cost shared equally between the Federal government and non-Federal sponsor.


6/ Work-in-kind may be in-kind services, materials or supplies (Reference Section 225 of WRDA 2000).

7/ Cost sharing percentage is based on the original Federal navigation project now causing the erosion.



## Instructions for Contributors to Planning Ahead

This newsletter is designed to improve the communication among all the planners and those we work with throughout the Corps. We hope that future editions will have mostly information and perspective from those of you on the front lines in the districts. We hope that these notes become a forum for you to share your experiences to help all of us learn from each other. We can't afford to reinvent the wheel in each office. We welcome your thoughts, questions, success stories, and bitter lessons so that we can share them on these pages. The articles should be short (2-3 paragraphs) except in some cases where you just have to say more.

- Use MS WORD
- Use “normal” style
- Use Times New Roman font, 11 point
- All text should be left justified with start of each paragraph indented by one tab stop.
- Each article should have short title with only initial letter of each word capitalized
- Following each title should be author's name and organization
- Last line should be contact information – phone number or e-mail address 

## Subscribing to Planning Ahead

To subscribe to our distribution list, send an e-mail message to [majordomo@usace.army.mil](mailto:majordomo@usace.army.mil) with no subject line and only a single line of text in the message body.

That single line of text should be: “subscribe ls-planningahead”.

If you want to be removed from the distribution list use: “unsubscribe ls-planningahead”.

To obtain a 'help' file, send only the word 'help' in the text of the message (nothing in the subject line) and address it to [majordomo@usace.army.mil](mailto:majordomo@usace.army.mil) .

The web site for additional information is: <http://eml01.usace.army.mil/other/listserv.html> 

## Submissions Deadline

The deadline for material for the next issue is **7 September 2001**

*Planning Ahead*, is an unofficial publication authorized under AR 25-30. It is published by the Planning and Policy Division, Directorate of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20314-1000, (<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwpnews.htm>)  
TEL 202-761-4574 or FAX 202-761-0464 or e-mail [Harry.E.Kitch@usace.army.mil](mailto:Harry.E.Kitch@usace.army.mil).

